Case: 12-35082, 02/21/2012, ID: 8080346, DktEntry: 5-1, Page 1 of 4

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 2 1 2012

٠ <u>×</u> ٠		United States Court of Appeals for BOOKETED DATE NITTA Dil CLIII.
PON MEN MEN	2012	Minth Circuit DATE INITIA
WYER OF AF	1 7	Wavid Mebbins Appellant
300 000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	$\mathbf{\alpha}$	*V5 (150 // 16-77()X/
WOLL WOLL	- 1	Microsoff, Inc. Appellee
`:	OOCKE	Supplement to Opening Briefing
		Microsoff, Inc. Supplement to Opening Briefing Comes now, pro se Appellant David Stebbins, who hereby submits the following supplemental brief.
		who hereby submits the following supplemental
		The state of the s
		I wish to take this opportunity to address a few things that the District Court said
TO A TO PROPERTY AND ADDRESS A	erranger et manifest ennige et gelektik gen, sitt enne et skale	a tew things that the District Court said
		per curiam that were Trivolous. Decayse
***************************************		the case was closed immediately after the
		was a opinion was docketed, I did not have
	er op transmission i de grant fan stransmission i de gra	a chance to raise them in the originating
		court, fortunately, as this court will soon see,
-,,,,-		the issues I raise in this supplementary
		briefing should have been painfully obvious, so the District Court had to have already known
		the District Court had to have already known
		about Them, anyway.
		first, all of my motions were denied as
	•	trivolous, How were they frivolous? The dis-
****	* •	trict court did not even try to explain how
TO ALLER		13uch arguments as 1/ Detendant is time-barred,
		2) Defendant's argument causes the contract to lack mutuality of obligation, and 3) there's no
alleas as	***************************************	lack mutuality of obligation, and 2) there's no
		law that says I can't do what I'm doing,
		are trivolous. hemember, to be frivolous, the

arguments must not merely be meritless, but must be so ridiculous that the petitioner had to have known that they are stupid, otherwise he is just an idiot. find it rather convenient that Judge Cohener did not give an explanation. If frivolousness of my case was so obvious that he felt that it would have been a waste of breath to explain it, then why did why did he bother with a per curian in the tirst place? Turther more, why am I allowed to appeal in forma pauperis. Doesn't the law specifically require courts to deny IFP status if the case is trivolous? don't think the district court actually thought the case was fix frivolous, but more The second issue I wish to point out is the reason the district court gave for not sanction anding me: He claimed that I raised "interesting questions" about the disparate negotiating power between businesses and con-sumers. This sounds like a pretty shallow reason for not sanctioning me. Not that I disagree with not being sanctioned-But is that the real reason I was not sanctioned? I doubt it. I think the district

was just looking for an excuse not to sanction me. But, again, more on that later Third and finally, the district court said that the forum I chose to air these "interesting questions" the court speaks of is not the legitimate forum to use. The arguments I raised in that category are that to allow one party to unilaterally amend a contract, but not the other party, caused the contract to be unconsionable and to lack mutuality of obligation I am not going to ask a phetorical question. What I am about to give is a statement: A court of competent jurisdiction is absolutely the correct forum to raise issues Such egrégious error can only be explained one way: The district court is under the Africasoft's thamb Oh, I am open to a be-Her explanation, but I have yet to hear one. In fact, I my whole purpose for filing this supplementary brieting is because I have received no explanation at all. So, if anyone has a better explanation, I am all hears. Otherwise, qui tacet consentiture videtur Before I sign off, I want to say this on public record: I need a public outery. can't do it on my own, though + tried my

Case: 12-35082, 02/21/2012, ID: 8080346, DktEntry: 5-1, Page 4 of 4

	best Public outcries DO work. They've worked
Final Company 4 (A) in the State of the Stat	before, and they can work again. Please don't give the bad guys any breathing room, here- That is all.
But within 10 Primary Case have not publicate entoting attractions attractions are serviced as a service of the	give the bad guys any breathing room, here-
ONE TO SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SE	That is all.
entrantian en constitui s'antata s'antata de la constitui de la constitui de la constitui de la constitui de l	David Febbins
was made for the state of the property of the	Agual Stellins
CARRA MES PARA LANGUAGO CONTRA TOMOS MESANTA TOMOS TOM	5800 Law Dr.
estimational estimation for the first interesting and residence in the second contract of t	Harrison, AR7260
and the state of t	CERTICITE AT MONTER
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
On the single feet from the substitute interpretable and dispectively the entirely a place again	Appellees have been served with this briefing by allowing them to view it on ECF.
ны тоттым с 1014 г. 2014 г. жилийн төхнөг хүйг хүүд хүйг хүүд хүйн хүй хүү хүй хүү хүү хүү хүү хүү хүү хүү	ing by allowing them to view it on ECT-
Semination with the individual semination of the	D., D. St. 11.
المراكز من خوا منافق المراكز ا	Pavid Stebbins Paval Klebens
The state of the s	5800 Law Dr
The state of the s	Harrison, AR 72601
The second state and a second	
The second of th	
- 1	
a may annow may a managan a managan na damaga a may annoy ang a sa	
and the state of t	
The second secon	
the COS control becomes the property and appropriate part of the control of the cost	